

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 24 have been examined. Claims 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2; Claims 1 – 6, 10 – 13, and 15 – 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,057,677 (“Bertagna”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,412,193 (“Swartz”); Claims 7 – 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bertagna and Swartz further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,367,452 (“Gallery”); and Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §130(a) as unpatentable over Bertagna and Swartz further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,873,069 (“Reuhl”).

1. Declaration

Applicants thank the Examiner for noting that the declaration fails to provide a date for the signature of one of the inventors. A Supplemental Declaration will be submitted when it has been executed.

2. Specification

The specification has been amended to provide the application number of a related application (“the '086 application”) that was filed concurrently with the present application and incorporated by reference. For the Examiner’s convenience, a copy of the '086 application as filed is submitted herewith.

3. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

Claim 15 has been amended to refer to the “currency data card” with the indefinite article “a,” thereby obviating the rejection.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 17, Applicants note that Claim 17 depends from Claim 15, which recites “a cash bag” in line 2, providing antecedent basis for the recitation of “the cash bag” in Claim 17. Claim 17 has been amended to remove the definite article “the” in referring to “end-of-flight contents” in case this was the intended subject of the rejection.

4. Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the prior-art rejections, the Office Action acknowledges that there is no disclosure in Bertagna of the claim limitations directed to the security drawer (Office Action, p. 5), relying on Swartz for this disclosure. While Applicants do not agree that Swartz discloses the claim limitations as originally recited, independent Claims 1 and 6 have been amended in the interest of advancing prosecution of the application. In particular, Claims 1 and 6 as originally filed require that the security drawer have locked and unlocked positions. This is not disclosed in Swartz, which merely discloses that a supermarket-checkout cart have “[a] cash drawer ... used for processing cash payments” (Swartz, Col. 7, ll. 49 – 50).

Independent Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite that the service drawer be part of a removable service drawer assembly configured such that the assembly cannot be removed when the security drawer is in the locked position. Support for such limitations is provided in the '086 application, which was incorporated by reference, at p. 9, ll. 18 – 20. MPEP 2163.07(b) (“The information incorporated is as much a part of the application as filed as if the text was repeated in the application”). Such a characteristic of a service drawer is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. In this context, Applicants note that these aspects of the claims permit use of the security drawer assembly as part of the systems and methods for controlling currency exchange and merchandise sales on aircraft, without modification of government-approved aviation service equipment ('086 application, p. 2, ll. 10 – 20). The ability to provide such a

system with equipment originally intended for transporting food trays on airlines (*see id.*, p. 4, ll. 2 – 5) provides significant advantages, including the ability to avoid additional time-consuming government approval procedures.


In addition to there being no teaching of these limitations in Swartz, there is also no motivation arising from the teachings of Swartz to modify its cash drawer in the manner now claimed. In particular, since Swartz is concerned only with a supermarket-checkout system, there is no reason to modify it in a manner that allows conformity with government-approved airline service equipment. Such conformity is enabled by the specific claim limitations discussed above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,


Patrick M. Boucher
Reg. No. 44,037

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
PMB:pmb
DE 7102612 v1